uttered big words, and yet ever and anon I observed that he turnr-d pale at his own courage." Except at those times when, as Burke says, it longs for domination, it can be quiet, and timid, and time-serving, and securely cloak itself under the old distinction of esoteric doctrine for the knowing few, and exoteric doctrine for the vulgar.

But the religious or superstitious principle cannot willingly allow its opposite to reign or prevail. *A* negation can exist anywhere; it is slippery, canny, and accommodating; but that "which is positive must have space and room, and it would drive out that which resists it. Hence the religious principle, as being the active, the undaunted, the unaccommodating, (or if you will) the intolerant principle, must, in ordinary circumstances, be the predominant one.

Infidelity soon learns that it is its easiest policy, not openly to withstand the popular religion and so raise its enthusiasm, but rather quietly to insinuate itself like a liquid through certain appropriate veins and channels of the body corporate, till it has soaked the whole in its own coldness and dampness. Hence religion is bold, uncompromising, and resolute, dther reigning or .seeking to reign: while infidelity, as seen, for instance, m**Illumc and Gibbon, the Keological critics of Germany, and the modern school of Pant-hoists, is cowering and cunning; dealing much in innuendo and insinuation ; generally walking with soft and stealthy .steps, satisfied with freedom from restraint, and quiet indulgences ; and fearing nothing so much as an earnest, and pure religion disturbing its complacency, and making it doubt of its own doubts. The historians referred to can tolerate, the grossest. superstition; the one can excuse Popery, and the other apologi/o for the riios-i. licentious "Paganism; and their wrath in .stirred up, only when a pure religion is exhibited in the- lives of the Puritans of the 37th century, or of the primitive Christians.

It cannot be doubted, we- think, that the prevalence of infidelity in France was promoted and hastened by the warm sentimentalist!! of Rousseau, more thun even by tho acute- exposures and ridicule of Voltaire. IE the writings of the latter, Infidelity is exhibited too much in its leanness and nakedness to oiler any attractions to the heart. The sceptical principle, no doubt, is gratified, and gloats over his pages; but the opposite principle rebels, and swells up in a rt'qurgitation of feeling. On the other hand, the religious principle is deceived, at least for a time, by the gorgeous drapery of sentiment, underneath winch lloussuan hides the hideous skeleton of infidelity. His sentimental faith and doctrinal scepticism served for a time to satisfy the deeper cravings of the human heart. But the music, a thin one after all, was noon stripped off. If Voltaire set the conscience against the intellect, Rousseau's writings set the intellect against the heart; and the contest was painful to those who did not wish to he disturbed by an internal schism. The

struqqle wan, as it were, 'embodied and acted in the unseemly contest, between Hume and Kousseau. The- mind of Franco, torn for a time, soon demanded something more consistent; and this it found in the *Gtuwdtt (‘hriftiunMH‘.)* and the nation, converted to infidelity by Rousseau, was reconverted to superstition by Chateaubriand. The writings of the latter have many of the Baniu elements of power as the former, and both address the two opposing feelings of man's religious naturo. There are passages of Chateaubriand, and more particularly of Ins *tjiiott-than* disciple Lanmrtine, which show, that amidst HUpenthounding faith of Henti-morit, there is a great deficiency of faith in truth; that, while there is sufficient Kl owinq enthusiast! to satisfy tbo cravings of natural religion, there in y<»t enough of latitude of doctrine to allow of the free working of pride and Hcilf-rightcousness.

Pantheism Is the form in which infidelity prevails on the Continent of I'lnmpe iu